

\*\*\*\*\*  
Call #203 - Yellowstone River - NE of Livingston project is hereby pulled  
from the January 26, 2012 letting. It is anticipated that the project will  
be  
advertised for the letting on August 23rd, 2012. Please check back for  
further information as it develops.  
\*\*\*\*\*

---

## Bid Letting: January 26, 2012

The January 26th, 2012 bid opening will take place in the 2nd Floor  
Conference Room instead of the MDT Auditorium.

---

### 201 - FOUR CORNERS - NORTH

\*\*\*\*\*

#### Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 15:37

An Addendum has been posted for this project. Please click on the  
following link to access the information. [ADDENDUM](#)

To download the addendum bid file, click here. [BID FILES](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

-1-

Submitted: Mon, 02-Jan-2012 08:57 MST

Company: Pumco Inc.

Contact: Chad D. Pumnea

Question:

Could you please post the Microstation and Geopak files? Thank you.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 11:30 MST

The design files for the requested project are posted on the MDT FTP site for  
your

use at: [UPDATED GEOPAK FILES](#)

The requested files do not represent the staked project, but are only design  
files.

The Department cannot guarantee the accuracy of the electronic data,  
particularly

as it may be called up by your computer, nor does any data in these files  
supersede

the data in the contract documents.

In addition, the Department will not make any revisions to the electronic  
files

pertaining to the staked project, change ordered work, or changes that are

---

-2-

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 14:06 MST

Company: Yellowstone electric

Contact: TIM ROSS

Question:

THERE IS NO LINE ITEM FOR DIRRECTIONAL BORING OR EXISTING, ON ANY OF  
THE CONDUITS, THEREFORE WE CAN ASSUME ALL CONDUITS ARE IN TRENCH ?

DOES THE REMOVED CANTELEVER STRUCTURE DELIVER TO HELENA OR A

YARD NEER BY ?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 04-Jan-2012 14:32 MST

1) Install conduit according to section 616 of the Standard Specifications for Road and Bridge Construction. MDT does not use different line items for trenched or bored conduit. Section 616 requires conduit installation by boring or otherwise not damaging the roadway.

2) Deliver salvaged material to the MDT Division Yard at 907 N Rouse Avenue, Bozeman, MT 59771-1110 or as directed by the project manager. Give two(2) working days notice to the Department Maintenance Chief before delivery of the salvaged equipment.

---

-3-

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 17:02 MST

Company: Knife River - Belgrade

Contact: Josh Walter

Question:

The geopak file that was linked does not appear to have the alignment data. Can you please check this and re-post the geopak file with the alignment data?

Thanks.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 10-Jan-2012 16:04 MST

The corrected geopak files can be found at the following link:

[UPDATED GEOPAK FILES](#)

The requested files do not represent the staked project, but are only design files.

The Department cannot guarantee the accuracy of the electronic data, particularly as it may be called up by your computer, nor does any data in these files supersede the data in the contract documents.

In addition, the Department will not make any revisions to the electronic files pertaining to the staked project, change ordered work, or changes that are made during construction to fit field conditions.

---

-4-

Submitted: Mon, 09-Jan-2012 13:29 MST

Company: Northwest Landscaping

Contact: Nichole Anderson

Question:

On the "Seeding Special Provisions" page 1 of 39 in the spec book; the project name listed is Safety Improvement-East of Manhattan Project No HSIP 205-1(27)15. Can you confirm this is the right seed spec for the Four Corners-North Project?

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 10-Jan-2012 12:30 MST

The seeding special in the Four Corners-North project is incorrect. The correct

seeding spec can be found at the following link: [SEEDING SPECIAL](#)

---

-5-

Submitted: Tue, 10-Jan-2012 16:42 MST

Company: A.M. Welles Inc.

Contact: Josh McKenzie

Question:

1. Special provision 21 talks about exposing existing utilities using Air-vacuum

excavation as directed by the engineer.

a. Can you give a better clarification when/where/ and amount of vacuum excavation that will be required?

b. There is no bid item for Miscellaneous Work- Per hour. Will this be under

Miscellaneous Work at an agreed upon hourly rate for all equipment and manpower?

2. Can you provide a detail or lengths for the 45mph design criteria for the

culvert detours. Thanks.

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 13:03 MST

1)a. The intent of this work is to expose the Northwestern Energy high pressure gas line and other underground utilities as deemed necessary. The Project Manager will direct the contractor when and where air-vacuum excavation is required.

1)b. Part 1 - An addendum will be issued to add 75 hours for the bid item "Miscellaneous Work-Hour".

1)b. Part 2 - Include all costs associated with this work under the Miscellaneous Work-Hour bid item that will be added by addendum.

2) Please reference SP #25 A. "Design detour and shoulder widening tapers to meet standards for a 45 mile/hour design speed and supply the detour designs to the Project Manager at least 10 working days before commencing with the construction of the detour or widening." Whether or not detours or widening are needed is dependent on the Contractor's operation. The Contractor develops and supplies the design details.

---

-6-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 10:19 MST

Company: Midland Electric & Contracting, Inc.

Contact: Robert Bouley

Question:

There are Bid Units for the following in the Quantity Summary, but nothing found in the plans.

375' - 1-1/2" Rigid Steel Conduit

235'- 2" Rigid Steel Conduit

25' - 2-1/2" Rigid Steel Conduit

85' - 3" Rigid Steel Conduit

I would like to know if the above rigid steel conduit applies to the steel 90 deg. elbows, nipples and couplings that go in the concrete pole bases, concrete controller pedestals, concrete pull boxes and service stub-ups. If this statement is correct, and the above 90 deg. elbows etc. will be paid to the contractor. Please answer with a yes. If not please explain.

Thank you!

Answer:

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 14:07 MST

The contractor's assumption of the location of the steel conduit is correct.

The items would be paid for as quantified in the summaries. All plastic conduit runs are terminated with steel conduit according to Section 616.03.2. Refer to the electrical plans foundation details for typical installations.

---

-7-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 12:20 MST

Company: Knife River - Belgrade

Contact: Josh Walter

Question:

What is the current status of the utility relocates? How much time has been allocated to the utility companies to relocate their respective facilities?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 08:15 MST

The utilities are to be relocated this spring after the frost is out of the ground.

We do not know how long this will take, for further information please contact

Northwestern Energy and Century Link.

---

-8-

Submitted: Fri, 13-Jan-2012 14:29 MST

Company: Knife River - Belgrade

Contact: Josh Walter

Question:

After reviewing the dirt run as well as the geopak files it doesn't appear that the

excavation (11,620 CY) and embankment (5,300 CY) at the PTW connection between stations 260+60.8 and 277+80.00 is accounted for in the grading summary. Please review. Thanks

Answer:

Submitted: Tue, 17-Jan-2012 10:10 MST

~~The quantities are shown on page 15 in the plans, and on pages 15 (for the excavation) and 16 (for the fill) in the dirt run pdf. (the fill is 4500 since it was~~

~~reduced by the shrink factor)~~

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 15:55 MST

Please see the answer posted for question 10.

---

-9-

Submitted: Fri, 13-Jan-2012 16:19 MST

Company: Knife River - Belgrade

Contact: Josh Walter

Question:

Special provision 32 - Ride Specification states that this will be a category one project. A portion of this project has a speed limit less than 45 mph as well as both paving edges controlled by curb and gutter. This project should be a combination of categories 1 and 3. Please review.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue, 17-Jan-2012 14:35 MST

Special Provision No. 32, RIDE SPECIFICATIONS FOR FLEXIBLE PAVEMENT, Paragraph C. 1st Sentence is hereby revised:

This is a Category III project from the South project limit to Durston Road (Sta. 94+82.00 to Sta. 160+00.00) and a Category I project from Durston Road to the North project limit (Sta. 160+00.00 to Sta. 260+60.80).

---

-10-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 08:44 MST  
Company: Riverside Contracting, Inc.  
Contact: Russ  
Question:

In reference to question no. 8 the volume adjustment you refer to was not added to the dirt run at these stations. Look at the last page of dirt run for mainline, it is not there. Therefore, your excavation quantity is understated by 11,620 cy and embankment by 4,500 cy (5400 w/shrink). Even though it shows up in the additional grading frame and the volume adjustment pages, it was not added to dirt run. Please adjust excavation qtys to reflect this.

Submitted: Wed. 18-Jan-2012 15:55 MST  
Three volume adjustments are not reflected in the dirt run. All are listed at Station 260+60.80 in the volume adjustments in the earthwork log file. The adjustments are:

1. 11,635 cuyd excavation, which covers the 11,620 cuyd for the northern PTW connection and the 15 cuyd for the approach at 272+00 Rt.
2. 5,400 cuyd emb+, which covers the 5,300 cuyd for the northern PTW connection and the 100 cuyd for the approach at 272+00 Rt. (the adjustment in the run is 4,500 cuyd, which incorporates the 1.2 shrink factor).
3. 1,755 cuyd emb+, which covers the topsoil in the northern PTW connection (the adjustment in the run is 1,462 cuyd, which incorporates the 1.2 shrink factor).

The excavation quantity is increased by 11,635 cubic yards to 127,105 cuyd, and the emb+ quantity is increased by 7,155 cuyd to 117,910 cuyd. The excess excavation is increased from 4,715 cuyd to 9,195 cuyd.

The corrected files can be found at the following link:

[UPDATED DIRT RUN PAGES](#)

[PLAN SHEET 15](#)

These adjustments will be changed by addenda.

---

-11-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 11:05 MST  
Company: Lumen FX Inc (Valmont)  
Contact: Frank Dugas  
Question:

With regards to the Overhead Cantilever Sign Structures at 94+22RT and 104+27.5RT, the 2009 AASHTO Specification requires the owner to specify many design parameters. Please specify the following design parameter options per the AASHTO 2009 worksheet.

1. Basic wind speed at location...
2. Design Life or Recurrence Interval...
3. Fatigue Category...
4. Galloping Loads: Advise if structures are to be designed to resist periodic galloping forces.
5. Truck loads: Advise if truck loads are to be included. If truck loads are included advise average truck speed.

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 08:11 MST

MDT's design requirements concerning overhead sign structures are based on AASHTO recommendations.

Referencing Fifth Edition AASHTO Standard Specifications for Structural Supports for Highway Signs, Luminaires and Traffic Signals, 2010 Interims and the plans:

Design Life: 50 yrs. per Table 3-3

Basic Wind Speed: 90 MPH per sheets S19 and S20 Fatigue Category:

1 per C11.6 Galloping Loads: Yes per Table 11-1 Truck Loads: Yes per Table 11-1 and Truck Speed 45 MPH per sheet S21.

NOTE: Natural Wind Gust loading is to be checked per Table 11-1.

---

## 202 - TOWNSEND - SOUTH

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 15:44

Replace sub section b) of Special Provision 28. Traffic Control Plan and Sequence

of Operations Part B, section 2) with the following: For the remainder of the project,

the grading on phase 1 can be complete when the full section of aggregate surfacing has been placed and treated with Liquid Asphalt (MC 70) on the east half

to a minimum of 7.8 meter roadway width. Reroute traffic onto the new roadway

utilizing appropriate traffic control devices in accordance with the Manual of Uniform

Traffic Control Devices.

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Fri, 20-Jan-2012 15:20

Please post as a clarification and link new Erosion Control Plans and Quad Map:

The Erosion Control Plans and Quad Map for this project have been modified and are hereby replaced.

The Erosion Control Plans were revised to show the correct project ending with no

"End Connection Area". The original advertised set of Erosion Control Plans had 14

sheets, the new have only 12 sheets.

The quad map was revised to show the correct project end station. The "End Project

Station" arrow has been adjusted to more accurately reflect the correct end station

location on the map.

EROSION CONTROL

QUAD MAP

\*\*\*\*\*

-1-

Submitted: Mon, 02-Jan-2012 08:58 MST

Company: Pumco Inc.

Contact: Chad D. Pumnea

Question:

Could you please post the Microstation and Geopak files?

Thank you.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 03-Jan-2012 11:30 MST

The design files for the requested project are posted on the MDT FTP site for your

use at: [GEOPAK FILES](#)

The requested files do not represent the staked project, but are only design files.

The Department cannot guarantee the accuracy of the electronic data, particularly

as it may be called up by your computer, nor does any data in these files supersede

the data in the contract documents.

In addition, the Department will not make any revisions to the electronic files

pertaining to the staked project, change ordered work, or changes that are made during construction to fit field conditions.

---

-2-

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 16:06 MST

Company: Penhall Company

Contact: Eric Blackburn

Question:

Please post the Full Set As-builts for the existing bridges to be removed.

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 04-Jan-2012 14:36 MST

The as-builts for the three structures to be removed have been posted to the following link: [AS-BUILTS](#)

However, it should be noted that significant widening has occurred on these structures since the original plans were drawn. The widening is not reflected on the as-builts posted here, and the bridge bureau has no record of the structures as-modified.

The existing structures should be field-examined by potential bidders to obtain any information necessary to submit an accurate bid for structure removal.

---

-3-

Submitted: Wed, 04-Jan-2012 07:52 MST

Company: Dick Anderson Construction, Inc.

Contact: Allan Frankl

Question:

The project is listed under the 1/26/12 letting, however the cover page on the proposal lists 1/12/12 as the bid date. Please confirm the correct bid date.

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 04-Jan-2012 10:45 MST

Sealed bids for construction of this project will be received by the Montana

Department of Transportation, Contract Plan Bureau, Room 101, 2701 Prospect, Helena, Montana until 9:00 a.m. on January 26, 2012. All bids will then be publicly opened, reviewed for correctness, and the publicly read in the Department's designated conference room.

---

-4-

Submitted: Wed, 04-Jan-2012 17:38 MST  
Company: Graham Construction & Management  
Contact: Nate Thomas

Question:

Sheets B2 and B3 downloaded from the FTP site have "Preliminary" stamped on them. Are these sheets to be used for bidding and construction purposes?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 08:34 MST

Sheets B2 and B3 have been corrected to eliminate the "Preliminary" stamp. There were no other changes to the two sheets. They are valid for bidding and construction purposes.

[REVISED PLAN SHEETS B2 AND B3](#)

---

-5-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 11:39 MST  
Company: LHC, Inc  
Contact: David Steely

Question:

What will the anticipated Notice To Proceed Date be for this project since it is not listed in item "3" of the special provisions?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 13:01 MST

The anticipated Notice to Proceed is March 5th 2012. The anticipated notice to proceed dates can be found at the following link:

[NOTICE TO PROCEED DATES](#)

---

-6-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 11:44 MST  
Company: LHC, Inc  
Contact: David Steely

Question:

Special Provision "20" "Clean Water Act Section 404 Permit" on page 16 of the proposal states that the permit will expire April 12, 2012. Will the State be

renewing this permit since it is set to expire prior to the completion of this project?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 18-Jan-2012 15:35 MST

MDT will secure a permit extension for this project.

---

-7-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 11:54 MST  
Company: LHC, Inc  
Contact: David Steely

Question:

Certain portions of the work in this project involve work partially in and around streams. Is this work, or any portion of it, required to be done by a contractor specifically approved or prequalified by the State for work in and around streams?

Answer:



Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 12:38 MST

There are no specific requirements for a stream contractor in the bid package. The contractor may elect to hire a stream restoration oversight professional to assist in or oversee any work in or around the affected streams.

---

-8-

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 11:51 MST

Company: Riverside Contracting, Inc

Contact: Russ

Question:

It appears the sub-excavation quantity (25,294m3) which is included in the grading frame(Emb. in Place) will not be available until after the east half (Phase 1) of the roadway is complete, thus making it waste. Will the additional

borrow required to replace this material be measured and paid for? If so, how

will it be paid for?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 15:39 MST

This material needs to be sub-excavated except as allowed by the Optional PTW Treatment Special Provision. Not only the sub-excavation but also the majority of the excavation for the project occurs on the west side of the mainline. There will be no separate measurement for payment of this material.

If the contractor envisions this material will have to be wasted off site for any

reason, that work will not be measured for payment. All excavation shown in the plans is required work and considered incidental to the cost of the embankment in place.

---

-9-

Submitted: Mon, 23-Jan-2012 08:36 MST

Company: Helena Sand and Gravel

Contact: Jason Fenhaus

Question:

We would like verification that this project is suppose to be designated Zone 1

for the Wage Rates.

Answer:

Submitted: Mon. 23-Jan-2012 9:00 MST

Special Provision #8 - Zone Pay - the designated Zone should be Zone 2, not Zone 1.

---

-10-

Submitted: Mon, 23-Jan-2012 09:56 MST

Company: LHC, Inc

Contact: David Steely

Question:

Regarding the Montana Irrigation Ditch where the new 4800 mm x2100 mm box culvert goes, can the irrigation ditch be closed down temporarily for the installation

of the box culvert, or must it be bypass-pumped? If it must remain open, does the

State know what kind of water volume needs to be maintained? A call was placed

to the number listed in the special provisions this morning, but we have not heard back from them yet.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 24-Jan-2012 15:43 MST

See special provision titled "Irrigation Operator Contact/Coordination".

---

## 203 - YELLOWSTONE RIVER - NE OF LIVINGSTON

Call #203 - Yellowstone River - NE of Livingston project is hereby pulled from the January 26, 2012 letting. It is anticipated that the project will be advertised for the letting on August 23rd, 2012. Please check back for further information as it develops.

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu. 29-Dec-2011 9:45 MST

REMOVE STRUCTURE SPECIAL PROVISION - Plan sheets for the existing bridge.  
EXISTING BRIDGE PLAN SHEETS

ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENT - Photos of retaining walls on Polson - East  
ARCHITECTURAL TREATMENT EXAMPLE PHOTOS

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu. 30-Dec-2011 10:25 MST

Attached are PDF Files of the available project alignment and/or structures geotechnical report(s), geotechnical report supplements, and geotechnical laboratory summaries. There is remaining geotechnical information that is voluminous and very difficult to compile in a concise manner.

Contractors are welcome to come to MDT Headquarters to inspect soil and/or rock samples taken for the project that are stored here or to look through the complete set of Geotechnical field investigation notes, laboratory testing, analytical, or other data in our project files.

It should be noted that the project may have undergone significant changes during the design process after the original geotechnical report and supplements were issued. Thus, some of the information contained in these documents may be out of date or not applicable with regard to the advertised project. Some of the changes include, but are not limited to: Project splits (for funding, ROW issues, etc.); alignment and grade changes; and changes due to environmental factors (sensitive areas, etc.).

The documents can be found at: GEOTECH REPORTS

\*\*\*\*\*

Submitted: Mon, 02-Jan-2012 08:58 MST  
Company: Pumco Inc.  
Contact: Chad D. Pumnea

Question:

Could you please post the Microstation and Geopak files?

Thank you.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 03-Jan-2012 9:35 MST

The design files for the requested project are posted on the MDT FTP site for your

use at: [GEOPAK FILES](#)

The requested files do not represent the staked project, but are only design files.

The Department cannot guarantee the accuracy of the electronic data, particularly

as it may be called up by your computer, nor does any data in these files supersede

the data in the contract documents.

In addition, the Department will not make any revisions to the electronic files

pertaining to the staked project, change ordered work, or changes that are made during construction to fit field conditions.

---

-2-

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 15:59 MST  
Company: Sletten Construction Company  
Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

Special Provision #20 requires the Contractor to provide a minimum of 40,000 gallons of storage for the contaminated water. Who owns the storage when the project is completed? How long must the storage be provided? Could MDT provide information including the distance the water must be pumped, the size of piping that is available for hooking into, and the type of fittings

necessary to hook up to BNSF's piping? Is power available to run the transfer

pumps? Will the storage facilities be emptied prior to the end of Phase 1 of the contract work? In other words, will the Contractor have to maintain the storage facilities through the 2012-2013 winter?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 04-Jan-2012 12:52 MST

1. The treatment and storage facility is located on BNSF property, however the temporary holding tanks are to be provided by the contractor. The tanks would be property of the Contractor upon completion of the project.

2. Distances for pumping the water can be estimated from the map provided in the special provision.

3. Storage is provided as long as necessary to treat the water. Settling times for suspended solids may be variable depending on the amount of solids pumped from excavations. Storage and maintenance of water in cold winter months may be needed (see section D of special provision 42) depending on when the last volume of water is pumped and treated.

4. Coordinate with the BNSF contact provided in section B of special provision 42, for questions regarding size of piping, fittings, power supply, and other items related to the treatment system.

---

-3-

Submitted: Wed, 04-Jan-2012 16:13 MST  
Company: Sletten Construction Company  
Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

We have been unable to figure out how to get the Phase 1 work completed within 225 "calendar days." We're figuring a double shift, with NO weather days, and NO core drilling of any of the drilled shafts, with everything going perfectly, but it still does not pencil out. Can you add another 30 calendar days?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu. 05-Jan-2012 12:08 MST  
No

---

-4-

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 13:33 MST  
Company: Cretex Concrete Products, Inc.  
Contact: Gary Williams

Question:

On Sheet 14 of 27 the Approach Pipe Summary lists the pipe at station 41+95.58 as 18" Concrete Class 3 and shows options for steel and aluminum. In the Culvert Summary Recap (same page) and the Plan Sheet 26 of 27 the station is listed as 18" RCP Cl 3. Please confirm that the pipe is to be RCP with no options.

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 11-Jan-2012 8:45 MST  
The Approach Pipe Summary on Sheet 14 is correct. The 18" pipe can be Concrete Class 3, steel, or aluminum. The Culvert Summary Recap on Sheet 14 and Plan Sheet 26 of 27 lists RCP as a bid quantity only but the other options are available. If a contractor elects to bid the CSP or CAP option for this particular pipe, bid it as the RCP 18 IN CLASS 3 bid item (Item No. 603 012 535). An addendum will NOT be issued to change the bid item to Drainage Pipe 18 Inch in this case.

---

-5-

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 15:44 MST  
Company: Sletten Construction Company  
Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

Sheet 19 of 27 shows the bottom of the concrete leveling pad for the MSE wall at a higher elevation than the bottom of the MSE wall. The cross sections show the same thing. Is this a mistake? Please clarify. Thanks.

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 06-Jan-2012 11:09 MST  
Sheet 19 is correct. Please refer to the note in the Elevation view on page 19.

---

-6-

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 15:59 MST  
Company: Frontier West, LLC  
Contact: Craig Lien

Question:

The tight time frame of this project will require immediate approval of contractor permits. Even if the required permits were submitted the day after the letting, which is 10 days before typical project award; it is

highly unlikely that any of the required permits would be approved by the February 17th notice to proceed. In our experience, permitting generally takes on the order of 4 to 6 weeks.

Between the lead time required to receive the shaft casing and the permitting issues. It would appear that 30 to 60 calendar days would be wasted without being able to perform significant critical path work.

If it is not possible to extend the calendar day portion of the contract to a more realistic time frame; would it at least be possible to delay the N.T.P. date until we can get the permits and/or required new materials and actually go to work?

Answer:

Submitted: Mon, 09-Jan-2012 13:30 MST

The Notice to Proceed date in Special Provision No. 2, CONTRACT TIME AND INCENTIVE/DISINCENTIVE, Paragraph B is hereby changed to February 29, 2012. An expedited Notice to Proceed will be issued with an effective date of February 29, 2012 for this contract. The awarded contractor must return signed contracts and insurance documents to the Contract Plans Bureau by Tuesday, February 21, 2012.

---

-7-

Submitted: Fri, 06-Jan-2012 09:26 MST

Company: Sletten Construction Company

Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

Special Provision 20 requires the Contractor to collect the drilled shaft cuttings. We interpret SP20 to mean that we must collect the cuttings removed from below the water table only. Is this correct?

Answer:

Submitted: Mon, 09-Jan-2012 10:40 MST

No. Collect all the cuttings and water from the drilled shafts as the shafts are being installed in a contaminated groundwater plume. Cuttings from above and below the water table may be segregated. Cuttings from above the water table may be segregated for alternative (non-landfill) disposal.

---

-8-

Submitted: Fri, 06-Jan-2012 11:30 MST

Company: Sletten Construction Company

Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

Your response to my question about the MSE wall is still unclear. The bottom elevations of the MSE wall are shown in the elevation view. The whole purpose of the MSE walls are to retain soil. Why would the bottom elevation need to be extended if the elevations shown on this sheet are already below the bottom of the concrete leveling pads as shown on this sheet? Are you trying to say that the bottom of the MSE walls could be higher than the elevations shown? It appears to me that what you probably want is to move the leveling pads down so they actually will be under the walls where they belong. Please clarify what you really want. Thanks.

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 06-Jan-2012 15:33 MST

The wall base elevations shown in the Elevation view, profile sheet and cross sections are correct. The elevation at the bottom of the concrete leveling pad is dependent upon which Mechanically Stabilized

Earth (MSE) Wall system is constructed. The MSE Wall systems are proprietary and MDT cannot specify a certain wall system. The type and design of the MSE Wall is the responsibility of the Contractor.

---

-9-

Submitted: Mon, 09-Jan-2012 16:52 MST  
Company: Morgen + Oswood Construction  
Contact: Randy Pedersen/Gregg Oswood  
Question:

After a reasonable review of the bridge disciplines to be completed on this project and knowing the existing time frames involved in the water permitting process and the restrictions related to instream work, we cannot complete a critical path schedule that fits the "225 Calendar Days" for Phase 1 Work!! Special Provision # 25. Sequence of Operations, states under B. that "This project is expected to require two construction seasons to complete." MDT is aware of the realistic time needed for this project. We think the additional time needed to complete this project is a minimum of 60 Calendar Days.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 10-Jan-2012 15:14 MST  
Please refer to Q&A numbers 3 and 6 regarding calendar days and notice to proceed date, respectively.

Wording within part B of Special Provision #25 (Sequence of Operations) does state that the project is expected to take two construction seasons to complete.

Phase 1 is to be completed in the first construction season and Phase 2 is to be completed in the 2nd construction season. Phase 2 as described under B. 2) includes work such as seeding, fencing, plant mix seal and cover and epoxy pavement markings.

---

-10-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 08:54 MST  
Company: TCA LLC  
Contact: Tracy Cowdrey  
Question:

After reviewing project and comments from other contractors we also believe the project can not be completed in time frame. Would not allow detour bridge with additional time. I believe this could save approx about 1,250,000 dollars on project.

Answer:

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 14:43 MST  
No.

---

-11-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 10:52 MST  
Company: SLETTEN CONSTRUCTION COMPANY  
Contact: JIM WICKENS  
Question:

With the revised NTP date, according to my count it brings Thanksgiving Day into consideration. Are you going to count Thanksgiving Day as a calendar day for completion requirements for phase 1? Also, if the contractor does not complete

the work within the allotted time, will the Contractor be charged \$10,000 per day disincentive for Christmas Day and New Years day?

---

-12-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 11:17 MST  
Company: Sletten Construction Company  
Contact: Jim Wickens

Question:

Special Provision No. 20, paragraph G states: "All costs associated with collection, transport, storage, testing, pumping, and filtering contaminated water are incidental to the bid item Contaminated Water." What tests are required on the water?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 08:12 MST

Testing of groundwater extracted from the drilled shafts is not required.

---

-13-

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 13:16 MST  
Company: FenceCrafters Helena Inc.  
Contact: Johnny Keintz

Question:

Could you provide a drawing and specification for the base plate required for the pedestrian rail fence post?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 14:14 MST

Please refer to the following information within Specification No. 61, Pedestrian Rail:

Section B. 1) b) - "Design all fence components and system, including attachment of the pedestrian rail to the bridge deck and to the roadway, to meet the requirements of AASHTO LRFD Bridge Design Specification 4th Edition 2007."

Section B. 7) "Base plate and anchor bolt assembly: Provide base plate as determined necessary by design meeting the requirements of AASHTO M270 Grade 36."

---

-14-

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 18:02 MST  
Company: Pumco Inc.  
Contact: Chad D. Pumnea

Question:

Special Provision #31 SPECIAL BORROW

B. Materials. Provide a minimum of 35% of the +No. 4 material with at least on

mechanically fractured face. Does this provision apply only to the subexcavation

areas, or to the entire project? Thank you.

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 13-Jan-2012 08:12 MST

This project has been pulled from the January 26th, 2012 letting. It is anticipated that it will be advertised for the August 23rd, 2012 letting.

---

**204 - LODGE GRASS - SOUTH**

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Wed, 04-Jan-2012 15:15 MST

The Mandatory Pre-Bid Conference date listed in Special Provision No. 4 and in the Invitation for Bids is incorrect. It is listed as Tuesday, January 9, 2012 at 10:00 a.m. in the MDT Billings Conference Room, 424 Morey Street, Billings, MT.

Tuesday is actually January 10, 2012. The Mandatory Prebid Conference will be held Tuesday, January 10, 2012. We apologize for the error.

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 09:53 MST

This TRAINING PROGRAM Special Provision is hereby made part of this contract. There will be two truck driver trainees for this project as required in the Project Specific Agreement with the Apsaalooke Nation included in the proposal. An Addendum will be issued to add the bid item "Training Program", 1000.0 hours for this contract.

TRAINING PROGRAM

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 10:34 MST

The following questions were asked at the Mandatory Pre-bid meeting. The answers to these questions are below.

Question:

The Contractor asked MDT to confirm the second bullet in Special Provision 24 C.20) on page 24 that read, "Provide two 4 inch (100 mm) cores the full depth of the plant mix surfacing, extracted from within a 5 inch (125 mm) radius of each designated location."

Answer:

Yes, this is correct.

Question:

The Contractor asked, "Will access breaks be allowed off of the project limits?"

Answer:

MDT cannot approve interstate access breaks beyond the limits of the project.

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 15:33

An Addendum has been posted for this project. Please click on the following link to access the information. [ADDENDUM](#)  
To download the addendum bid file, click here. [BID FILES](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Mon, 23-Jan-2012 13:28



The Mandatory Pre-Bid Conference Attendance Record for this contract is attached.

MANDATORY PRE-BID

\*\*\*\*\*

Submitted: Fri, 20-Jan-2012 11:18 MST

Company: Mountain West Holding Co

Contact: Chris Connors

Question:

The Revise Bridge Rail Concrete Barrier work on this contract will move the connection point for the new Bridge Approaches as shown on the plans. Is the contractor to drill new holes in the existing w-beam rail to accomodate the revised connection location as torch cutting is no longer acceptable? How will conflicts between old and new holes in the existing w-beam be handled?

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 24-Jan-2012 15:40 MST

New holes may be drilled in the W-Beam rail to facilitate the installation. Adjustments to the first post spacing may be allowed with approval from the Project Manager. Conflicts between old and new holes in the existing w-beam are to be handled on a case-by-case basis.

---

**205 - GEORGETOWN - PHILIPSBURG & SF079 APPR RCNST - S OF DRUMMOND**

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu. 29-Dec-2011 9:50 MST

This CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404 PERMIT AND SECTION 401 CERTIFICATION Special Provision is hereby made part of the contract. The requirements are applicable to the Georgetown - Philipsburg project (STPP-HSIP 19-1(48)27).

CLEAN WATER ACT SECTION 404 PERMIT AND SECTION 401 CERTIFICATION

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Fri. 20-Jan-2012 9:41 MST

Special Provision No. 1 - PROJECT DESCRIPTION(S) is hereby replaced. The special provision in the printed proposal did not contain descriptions of both tied projects in the contract. We apologize for the error.

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Mon, 23-Jan-2012 15:34 MST

Erosion Control Plans, Quad Map and Location Map for the HSIP 19-2(22)63, SF079 APPR RCNST-S OF DRUMMOND project are hereby made part of this contract.

Special Provision No. 9, AUTHORIZATION TO DISCHARGE UNDER THE MONTANA POLLUTANT DISCHARGE ELIMINATION SYSTEM (MPDES) applies to both projects in this contract. Include costs associated with meeting the requirements of this special provision in the Temporary Erosion Control - Lump Sum bid item for both projects in this contract.

EROSION CONTROL PLANS

STATE LOCATION MAP

QUAD MAP

\*\*\*\*\*

-1-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 13:45 MST

Company: Jim Gilman Excavating, Inc.  
Contact: Paul Thompson  
Question:

We are concerned about when contract time will start for this project. If it starts on the usual date of April 16th, we calculate that the 60 days of contract time would expire on July 10th. If we allow time for 2 coats of pavement markings, as well as the 4th of July holiday, this means the seal & cover would need to be completed by the end of June. This seems a little early in the season and may force contractors to chip in marginal weather. Also, many chip jobs held over from last year are already scheduled for the early part of the chip season. Will the MDT allow flex time to June 4th for this project?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 13-Jan-2012 07:46 MST

Standard Specification 409.01.1 states that in cases where seal coat and pavement markings are the only remaining items of work, contract time will be suspended until the first working day following the July 4th holiday.

---

-2-

Submitted: Tue, 17-Jan-2012 09:30 MST  
Company: Mountain West Holding Co.  
Contact: Keith Johnston  
Question:

Will all the traffic control associated with the HSIP 19-3(22)63 portion of the contract be paid under the Traffic Control - Devices bid item. Special provision 16 states that all signing and traffic control should be included in the lump sum item for traffic control, since there is no bid item for lump sum traffic control I am assuming this will be paid by the unit.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue, 17-Jan-2012 10:42

Special Provision No. 16, TRAFFIC CONTROL AND SEQUENCE OF OPERATIONS [HSIP 19-2(22)63],  
Paragraph E. Basis of Payment is hereby revised.

E. Basis of Payment. Consider all costs associated with the proposed sequence of operation as incidental to the completion of the work; include these costs in other bid items. Include all costs associated with signing and traffic control in the unit price bid for Traffic Control - Devices CB. Accomplish and pay for traffic control in accordance with section 618 of the Standard Specification and the "Traffic Control Rate Schedule" found elsewhere in this proposal.

---

## 206 - THREE FORKS - WEST

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 29-Dec-2011 10:00 MST

The Schedule of Items in the Bid Proposal contains an error. Miscellaneous Work (Item No. 104 030 010) is shown as 10,000.00 Units. It should be 20,000.00 Units. The Expedite Bid File is correctly showing 20,000.00 Units.

\*\*\*\*\*

-1-

Submitted: Tue, 03-Jan-2012 10:20 MST  
Company: Pavement Maintenance Solutions, Inc.

Contact: Chris Rasmussen

Question:

The specifications include Type 2 Cover Material. Typically the type 2 is used in urban areas with slower traffic speeds. Also, Type 2 is more expensive to produce. Would the Department consider Type 1 Cover Material for this project?

Answer:

Submitted: Wed. 04-Jan-2012 8:48 MST

No, Type II cover material is required.

---

-2-

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 10:27 MST

Company: Knife River - Belgrade

Contact: Jackie Flikkema

Question:

What is the anticipated completion date for the bridge job on Hwy 287 and I-90? This job is 4.4 miles and approximately 3 miles is affected by the existing job. If the bridge job is still in progress how will we "provide the least amount of inconvenience possible to the traveling public" when the existing job has one-lane I-90 traffic?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri, 06-Jan-2012 8:10 MST

The Turnbay - West Three Forks Interchange project is scheduled to be completed in June 2012. The Flex Time Proceed Date of July 9, 2012 is intended to assist in reducing conflicts between the two projects. Coordination of the work will be required if the Contractor elects to begin work before the flex NTP date.

---

## 207 - HOBSON - SIDEWALKS

-1-

Submitted: Wed, 18-Jan-2012 09:52 MST

Company: James Talcott Construction

Contact: Nikole Duke

Question:

1) Specifications call for expansion joint around Concrete Building approach, I know that the one side of the road is all buildings so are there any approaches that need to be worked around?

Answer:

Submitted: Mon. 23-Jan-2012 14:55 MST

Yes, the Concrete Building Approaches are at the locations of the 6 inch sidewalk listed in the summary frames.

---

## 208 - W ROUNDUP ROCKFALL REPAIR/MT 11-1

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 05-Jan-2012 09:00 MST

Additional excavation has been identified for removal. An addendum will be issued to revise Unclassified Excavation quantities. Attached is a link to revised sheets no. 3 (grading frame) and no. 4 (Excavation Detail).

[REVISED PLAN SHEET NOS. 3 & 4](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

Clarification:

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 15:42

An Addendum has been posted for this project. Please click on the following link to access the information. [ADDENDUM](#)

To download the addendum bid file, click here. [BID FILES](#)

\*\*\*\*\*

-1-

Submitted: Wed, 11-Jan-2012 11:25 MST

Company: Stillwater Excavating

Contact: Greg Russell

Question:

1. What are the construction limits on the project?
2. Does the State/Contractor have access to the top of the cut from the county road just West of the project?
3. Is there a spoil site available for the excess excavation?

Answer:

Submitted: Thu, 12-Jan-2012 09:14 MST

1. MDT has secured a Temporary Construction Permit that extends 100 ft. beyond the R/W from Sta 10+00 to Sta 14+22.19 LT, (see attached).

[ROUNDUP ROCK EXHIBIT](#)

2. MDT has secured landowner permission for the Contractor to ingress and egress across private property from Johnson Road to the work area. The Contractor must coordinate the exact route with the land owner and the Project Manager prior accessing the property. Existing fence which may be disturbed will be reset or reconstructed and fence closure will be maintained at all times. Ground disturbed by construction will be topsoiled and reseeded with vegetation species compatible with other vegetation in the vicinity.

Fencing work required to facilitate access will be paid as miscellaneous work.

Seeding work will be paid under the associated bid items. Any other damage done to the land due to the ingress and egress of equipment will be repaired to the satisfaction of the landowner and the Project Manager and is not measured for payment.

3. Disposal of excess excavation not designated as salvage in Special Provision #17 is the responsibility of the Contractor and must be disposed of outside the R/W and in accordance with all applicable laws, rules and regulations. Disposal of excess excavation material is not measured separately for payment.

---

-2-

Submitted: Thu, 19-Jan-2012 08:52 MST

Company: Patrick Albin Carlson JV

Contact: Joel Slate

Question:

The Special Provisions call for salvaging ALL rip rap 1'-4' in diameter, with an estimated quantity of 5,500 cubic yards. If rip rap in excess of 5,500 yards is generated, will it be paid for as rip rap instead of unclassified excavation?

Answer:

Submitted: Fri. 20-Jan-2012 8:53 MST

All excavation is paid for as unclassified excavation. All rip rap that meets specifications and is salvaged, hauled to and stockpiled at the designated site will also be paid for as Process, Stockpile Riprap. The 5,500 CY quantity listed in the plans is for estimating purposes only, final payment for this item is for the actual approved quantity processed and stockpiled.

---

-3-

Submitted: Mon, 23-Jan-2012 09:42 MST

Company: Knife River - Yellowstone

Contact: Van Hildreth

Question:

1. The existing roadway is most likely going to be destroyed during the process of this project. There is no items for resurfacing the roadway. In what condition is the contractor required to leave the roadway after the excavation is completed.

2. At each bench layer coming down the slope, the drill needs around 3' of additional set-back room in the previous shot slope in order for the boom of the drill the required 3/4:1 and 1/2:1 slopes. This is not accounted for in the plans or cross sections. Will overexc be acceptable and would it be paid for in quantity.

Answer:

Submitted: Tue. 24-Jan-2012 12:30 MST

1) MDT does not anticipate that the work will cause major damage to the roadway.

If the roadway receives damage that is inherent of the work and not caused by Contractor negligence, then the roadway is to be repaired by as directed the Project

Manager and will be paid for as Miscellaneous Work.

2) Section 203.03.1.B.4.b states "When the cut height exceeds 30 feet (10 m), an offset from the staked slope line, not to exceed 2 feet (610 mm) is allowed at the top of each lift after the top lift. The actual slope cannot deviate from the plan slope by more than 2 feet (610 mm)." The excavation will be measured and paid in accordance with section 203.